



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

ment of the colony by the London Company afterwards, was much more despotic than it had been under the first charter, when the company was controlled by the King; for then the council in Virginia had the privilege of choosing its own president, who was the governor. All this appears of necessity in Dr. Brown's book, for he could not entirely suppress the administrations of Gates, Dale, and Argall, nor the bitter complaints of the colonists, as shown even in papers issued by the assembly. We have to look further north for the first republic in America.

The key to Dr. Brown's serious mistakes in the very frame-work of his volume, is his bitter hostility to Captain John Smith, and his determination to brand as false every statement made by him, or in his praise, touching his conduct in Virginia. Of the twenty-three pages of his preface he devotes some twenty to violent abuse of Smith, and he never mentions him in the text without a flat contradiction, or an insinuation of dishonesty, or a sneer. Smith stated that the colony was better managed under the first charter than under the second and third, and he favored the renewal of the royal control which was effected in 1624. He was not singular in this. Many members of the company, and nearly all of the colonists, agreed with him, and the result justified them. But Dr. Brown, who fancies that the colony was a republic under the second and third charters, denounces Smith as an enemy of the colony, and is utterly unable to accord him any credit for his services in Virginia. These services have heretofore been held to have been valuable by historians, even by those who have discredited some of Smith's statements.

It would be easy, though tedious, to follow Dr. Brown in his frequent attacks upon Smith, and expose his injustice. But this must be reserved for another time. It need only be said here, that both Smith and Purchas wrote from ample contemporaneous authorities, existing before the differences arose in the London Company which caused its dissolution. And it may be added, that to have expected a company in London to continue to have the civil government over a colony in America growing into a state, would have been absurd in the extreme.

WM. WIRT HENRY.

*A Quaker Experiment in Government.* By ISAAC SHARPLESS, President of Haverford College. (Philadelphia: Alfred J. Ferris. 1898. Pp. 280.)

THE "Quaker Experiment" of which President Sharpless treats in this little volume—a monograph it must fairly be called—is that endeavor to establish civil government on ethical principles which William Penn, in his letter to James Harrison, August 25, 1681, termed "an Holy Experiment," and which he ardently hoped he might then find room for in America, though not in England. The experience of seventy-five years, from the summer of 1681, when Markham, provided with Penn's commission, reached the banks of the Delaware, and notified

the Duke of York's officials of the change of authority, down to the summer of 1756, when the followers of Penn withdrew under compulsion from further control of the colony—this experience it is upon which President Sharpless has written this intelligent and fair-minded essay. Its merits may not be appreciated, perhaps, for the book is in every way modest—in style, in dimensions, in print, even in binding—but it is a valuable piece of advice which we here present to those who care to be well informed concerning the colonial period in Pennsylvania, to get it, and read it through.

The plan of Penn and his associates, when they formed their government of Pennsylvania in 1682, was not merely democratic, but ethical, and on both accounts they raised up embittered enemies, who in the end prevailed against them. The fullness of power accorded the people, in the assembly, was always offensive in England, and even Thomas Penn—a son of the founder indeed, but much removed in temper and opinion—did not hesitate to say in 1760 (in a letter to Governor Hamilton), that he had “no disregard” for the Friends, *except* “on their leveling Republican system of government.” But it was on its ethical side that the Quaker experiment most invited attack. It proposed complete religious liberty. But that would give equal rights and opportunities to Jews and Papists! It proposed to deal fairly with the Indians. But that would starve out the land-grabbers and the dishonest traders. It proposed to be peaceable, and indulged the hope that thus peace would be maintained. But in such a system where was the place for the professional fighting man, or the opportunity for him to get “glory,” or acquire plunder and prizes? It proposed a simple and strictly administered government. But that would cut out sinecures, and soft and easy places for “younger sons.” Moreover, it proposed temperate and orderly living. What community could long tolerate that without rebellion? Because thou art virtuous, said Sir Toby Belch to Malvolio, dost thou think there shall be no more cakes and ale?

Under all the attacks which it thus invited, the Quaker experiment ultimately went down. We cannot say it failed; it was headed off. It did not come to an end; it was “side-tracked.” In its high ideal of 1682 it could not and did not permanently continue. The strict code of conduct, Puritanism refined, of the “Great Law” of 1682, was not long strictly enforced, though the social condition of the colony was always exceptionally temperate, orderly, and humane. The complete religious equality first accorded was impaired about the end of the century, under pressure from England, and tests excluding others than orthodox Protestants were exacted from members of the assembly and all civil officers.

But above all it was the peace policy of the Friends which most excited derision and anger. If the impression prevails amongst many English-speaking people, professing Christians, at the end of the nineteenth century, that fighting is normal, and the intervals of peace only periods of “preparation” for the next war, what could have been the common view at the end of the seventeenth? The realization by those who

watched them that Penn's colonists were actually endeavoring to avoid a military system and a war equipment, that they conceived there was really "no need for arsenals or forts," drew down upon them contempt from every quarter. Upon all the lines of argument which seemed reasonable to ordinary men, it could be demonstrated that such an experiment in government must fail. "Of all Friendly ideas," says President Sharpless, "the most difficult to incorporate practically into government machinery was that of peace," and this statement must be accepted with the fullest emphasis and significance that the language will bear. It *was* the most difficult; it is even now the most difficult, nearly a century and a half after the day the Friends surrendered their control of the Pennsylvania assembly.

The demand that the colony should arm itself, should "provide a militia," should furnish troops for the King's service, came with the English Revolution. The official news that James the Second was succeeded by William and Mary reached Philadelphia at the beginning of October, 1689, and the dispatch containing it stated also that His Majesty had ordered "all necessary preparation for a speedy war with the french king." Such orders the governor, that testy formalist, Captain John Blackwell, called on the assembly to respect, and the assembly, compelled to make an answer, then and later formulated the principles upon which the Friends endeavored to direct, and as a matter of fact, did direct, Pennsylvania's action in relation to such demands from the crown, down to their resignation of control in 1756. These principles were: (1) That the governor, being under the terms of Penn's charter captain of the military forces, was *ipso facto* empowered to organize troops, if he considered them necessary; (2) that there were available to him, for such purposes, those citizens who did not entertain the scruples of Friends concerning war; (3) that the assembly would vote money, to the extent which in their judgment the colony could afford "for the King's use." What that use might be His Majesty would decide. If he spent the money for war, he and not the assembly was accountable.

It cannot be said that this system did not answer fairly well for many years. The exigencies of Captain Blackwell's time were gotten over, Colonel Fletcher's arbitrary rule of two years was endured, the follies and futilities of young Governor Evans passed by, and then the treaties of Utrecht and the policy of Walpole gave the English colonies, with the mother country, a long breathing-spell of peace, and the unmilitary community on the Delaware prospered and grew. "Notwithstanding all difficulties and imperfections," says President Sharpless, justly, "there was for seventy years an efficient government in Pennsylvania, based largely on Penn's ideas. There were no wars or external troubles. The home affairs were quiet and orderly. Prosperity and contentment reigned, immigrants came in unprecedented numbers, and the public finances were so managed as to encourage trade, and lay no unnecessary burdens. Peace and justice were for two generations found available defenses for a successful state." The colony had, indeed, the service of able and intelli-

gent men. The speakers of the assembly, men like Joseph Growdon, Edward Shippen, David Lloyd, Andrew Hamilton, John Kinsey, and Isaac Norris, made a group of colonial statesmen inferior to none under the English flag in America, for the work assigned them. Their strength was fully equal to any local strain which the maintenance of an orderly government in their own province might have put upon them, however unequal it was to meet a three-fold attack from disaffected elements in their own population, from hostile critics in other colonies, and from the organizers of war in the mother country.

President Sharpless observes with truth that "no one can appreciate the history of Colonial Pennsylvania who does not understand the spirit, the methods, and the beliefs of the Society of Friends. The failure to grasp these firmly, the dependence upon public records exclusively for the materials of history, has been the cause of serious misjudgments." His own work is fair-minded and straightforward, and while he puts himself naturally and readily into the place of those who endeavored the Quaker commonwealth, he deals with his subject in a spirit of simple candor which the reader cannot but recognize and enjoy.

HOWARD M. JENKINS.

*American History told by Contemporaries.* Edited by ALBERT BUSHNELL HART, Professor of History in Harvard University. Vol. II., Building of the Republic, 1689-1783. (New York: The Macmillan Co. 1898. Pp. xxi, 653.)

PROBABLY the universal judgment would be that the period of Professor Hart's first volume is much richer in interesting materials of the sort which he is seeking to make known to students than that covered in the present volume. By comparison with the age of discovery and settlement and the days of Puritan enthusiasm, these ninety-four years, and especially the first seventy of them, were a dry time; the world was its own god, and Sir Robert Walpole was its prophet. Yet Professor Hart has attacked his new problem with so much force and enterprise and ingenuity that it is doubtful whether he has not made the second volume more interesting even than the first. The interest is of a different kind, to be sure. The editor has perceived that it must be so, that the period appeals to a different element in the student, young or old, that, while it is still possible to be entertaining, the emphasis must now be laid on political affairs and especially on the development of American institutions of government. More space might well have been given to the development of American economic life, considering its vital importance in a new country; but the growth of political institutions is certainly illustrated in a most varied and interesting manner. The skill with which this has been accomplished strikes the reader as perhaps the great success of the volume. The machinery of English control and the theories of Englishmen and provincials respecting it, the powers and duties of governors, the character and conduct of colonial assemblies and judicial